Anthony Boskovich, No. 121198 Law Offices of Anthony Boskovich 28 N. First Street, 6th Floor San Jose, California 95113-1210

policemisconduct@compuserse.com

FILED

2008 JUN 24 P 2:38

RICHARD W. WIEKING CI ERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT NO. DISTLOF CA.S.J.



7 8

9

3

5

10

11

13

NANCY NAVA,

27

Complaint for Violation of Civil Rights -28 || Jury Trial Demanded

Santa Clara police officer; F. SAUNDERS,



IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN JOSE DIVISION

Plaintiff,

C08 03066

COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS - JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

14 MIKE SEADLER, individually and in his capacity as a Santa Clara police officer; CLYDE CHENG, lindividually and in his capacity as a Santa Clara police officer; ALEX TORKÉ, individually and in 16 his capacity as a Santa Clara police officer; A. WOLF, individually and in his capacity as a Santa Clara police officer; S. MAJOROS, individually and in his capacity as a Santa Clara police officer; T. SHEARER, individually and in his capacity as a Santa Clara police officer; J. FANUČCHI, individually and in his capacity as a Santa Clara police officer; T. NIESEN, individually and in his capacity as a Santa Clara police officer; M. OVER, individually and in his capacity as a Santa Clara police officer; DAN WINTER, individually and in his capacity as a Santa Clara police sergeant; A. LANGE, individually and in his capacity as a Santa Clara police officer; R. CIRAULO, individually and in his capacity as a Santa Clara police officer; J. MASTILOCK, individually and 24 lin his capacity as a Santa Clara police officer; A. LAYTON, individually and in his capacity as a 25 ||Santa Clara police officer; J. GREEN, individually and in his capacity as a Santa Clara police officer; 26 D. RUSH, individually and in his capacity as a

18

19

21

24

25

27

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

findividually and in his capacity as a Santa Clara
police officer; D. MACHADO, individually and
in his capacity as a Santa Clara police officer;
I. OLIVER, individually and in his capacity as a
Santa Clara police officer; B. STERKEL,
individually and in his capacity as a Santa Clara
police officer; JOHN DOE and RICHARD ROE,
individually and in their capacities as Santa Clara
police officers, the true names and exact numbers
of whom are unknown at this time; CITY OF
SANTA CLARA, a municipal corporation,
Defendants.
·

JURISDICTION

1. This action arises under Title 42 of the United States Code, section 1983. Jurisdiction is 12 conferred upon this Court by Title 28 of the United States Code, sections 1331 and 1343. The unlawful acts and practices occurred in the County of Santa Clara which is within this judicial district.

PARTIES

- 2. Plaintiff, NANCY NAVA, is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a legal citizen of the United States and a resident of Santa Clara, California.
- 3. Defendant CITY OF SANTA CLARA, hereinafter "CITY", is a public entity duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California.
- 4. At all times mentioned herein, defendants MIKE SEADLER, CLYDE CHENG, ALEX TORKE, A. WOLF, S. MAJOROS, T. SHEARER, J. FANUCCHI, T. NIESEN, M. OVER,

Complaint for Violation of Civil Rights -28 Jury Trial Demanded

9

10

1	DAN WINTER, A. LANGE, R. CIRAULO, J. MASTILOCK, A. LAYTON, J. GREEN, D.
2	RUSH, F. SAUNDERS, D. MACHADO, J. OLIVER, B. STERKEL, JOHN DOE and
3	RICHARD ROE (hereinafter "OFFICERS"), were employed as police officers for defendant
4	CITY. Defendant officers are sued individually and in their capacity as police officers for the CITY.
5	By engaging in the conduct described here, defendant officers acted under the color of law and in
6	the course and scope of their employment for defendant CITY. By engaging in the conduct
7	described here, defendant officers exceeded the authority vested in them as police officers under the
8	United States Constitution and as employees of the CITY.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

- 5. On 18 September 2007, plaintiff drove her son and daughter, along with her grandson, to the Bank of America located at 2900 El Camino Real in the City of Santa Clara.
- 6. While her son and daughter went into the bank to cash a check, Ms. Nava waited in the car with her grandson.
- 7. At approximately 6:15 P.M., Ms. Nava heard a male voice, believed to be MIKE SEADLER, yelling "Hey you in the blue car!" When Ms. Nava, who did not clearly understand that the voice was directed at her, said "Who, me? What did I do?", she was told to put her hands on the steering wheel, and then given meticulous instruction on how to get out of the car, to back up, and then go to the ground.

4

5

8

9

- 8. There were in excess of 10 OFFICERS, including SEADLER, pointing guns at her, and 1 | despite her explanation that she had arthritis, Ms. Nava was taken to the ground on her knees and handcuffed without explanation.
 - 9. Ms. Nava was seated in the back of a patrol vehicle, and she watched the OFFICERS point their weapons at her young grandson, terrifying him, and then watched them search the vehicle without permission or warrant.
 - 10. Ms. Nava was forced to remain in the car until 7:36 P.M. without explanation, and then was released, being told that it was a mistake.

DAMAGES

- 11. As a proximate result of defendants' conduct, plaintiff suffered pain and physical injuries. As a further proximate result of defendants' conduct, plaintiff suffered severe emotional and mental distress, fear, terror, anxiety, humiliation, embarrassment, and loss of her sense of security, dignity, and pride as a citizen of the United States.
- 12. As a further proximate result of defendants' conduct, plaintiff has incurred medical expenses and lost time from her usual occupation in an amount according to proof.
- 13. The conduct of defendant OFFICERS was malicious, wanton, and oppressive. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to award of punitive damages against defendant OFFICERS.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

26

27

[14. Plaintiff found it necessary to engage the services of private counsel to vindicate his rights
under	r the law. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to an award of all attorney's fees incurred in relation to
this a	ction for violation of his civil rights.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(42 U.S.C § 1983) (Against defendants OFFICERS)

- Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 14 of this complaint.
- 16. In doing the acts complained of, defendants OFFICERS acted under the color of the law to deprive the plaintiff of certain constitutionally protected rights, including, but not limited to:
- a. The right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures, as guaranteed by the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution;
- b. The right to be free from arrest without probable cause, as guaranteed by the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution;
- c. The right not to be deprived of life or liberty without due process of law, as guaranteed by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution;
- d. The right to be free from the use of excessive force by police officers and other government actors, which is guaranteed by the Fourth, Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution; and.
- e. The right to be free from interferences with the zone of privacy, as protected by the Fourth and Ninth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

17. As a proximate result of defendants' wrongful conduct, plaintiff suffered injuries and 1 damages as set forth.

3 4

2

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief as set forth.

5 6

7

8

10

12

13

15

16

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

26

27

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(42 U.S.C. § 1983) (Against Defendant CITY OF SANTA CLARA)

18. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference herein paragraphs 1 through 17 of this complaint.

- 19. The CITY, by and through its supervisory officials and employees, has been given notice on repeated occasions of a pattern of ongoing constitutional violations and practices by defendant OFFICERS herein and other Santa Clara police officers, consisting of the use of the illegal search. scizure, and arrest of citizens, as well as the use of excessive force against citizens. Despite said notice, defendant CITY has demonstrated deliberate indifference to this pattern and practice of constitutional violations by failing to take necessary, appropriate, or adequate measures to prevent the continued perpetuation of said pattern of conduct by Santa Clara police officers. This lack of an adequate supervisorial response by defendant CITY demonstrates the existence of an informal custom or policy which tolerates and promotes the continued illegal search, seizure, and arrest of citizens, as well as the continued use of excessive force against citizens, by Santa Clara police officers.
- 20. The acts of defendant police officers alleged herein are the direct and proximate result of the deliberate indifference of defendant CITY and its supervisory officials and employees to violations of the constitutional rights of persons by defendant OFFICERS herein, and other

Complaint for Violation of Civil Rights -Jury Trial Demanded

28 ||Jury Trial Demanded

1 Imembers of the Santa Clara Police Department. The plaintiff's injuries were foreseeable and a proximate result of the deliberate indifference of the CITY to the pattern, practices, customs, and 2 policies described above. 3 4 5 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff prays for relief as set forth. 6 THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Assault and Battery) (Against defendants OFFICERS) 10 21. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference herein paragraphs 1 through 20 of this 11 complaint. 12 13 22. Defendant OFFICERS placed plaintiff in immediate fear for her safety by pointing their 14 15 guns at her and then forcing her out of her car. Defendant OFFICERS committed assault and 16 | battery against plaintiff by pointing their guns at her and then forcing her out of her car without justification without justification. 18 23. Defendants' conduct was neither privileged nor justified under statute or common law. 19 20 24. As a proximate result of defendants' wrongful conduct, plaintiff suffered damages as set 21 22 forth. 23 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief as set forth. 24 25 26 27 Complaint for Violation of Civil Rights -

Page 9

1

33. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the conduct of defendant OFFICERS, as described herein, was motivated by racial prejudice against plaintiff. By engaging lin such conduct, defendants violated plaintiff's rights under California Civil Code section 51.7 to be free from violence or intimidation by threat of violence committed against them because of her race. color, or ancestry.

34. Under the provisions of California Civil Code section 52, subdivision (b), defendants are liable for each and every offense for each and every offense for exemplary damages, for twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000) in addition thereto, and for the payment of plaintiff's attorney fees.

35. As a proximate result of defendants' wrongful conduct, plaintiff suffered damages as set forth.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief as set forth.

SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Negligence) (Against defendants OFFICERS)

36. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference herein paragraphs 1 through 35 of this complaint, except for any and all allegations of intentional, malicious, extreme, outrageous, wanton. and oppressive conduct by defendants, and any and all allegations requesting punitive damages.

37. At all times herein mentioned, defendants were subject to a duty of care, to avoid causing unnecessary physical harm and distress to citizens in the exercise of the police function. The conduct of defendants, as set forth herein, did not comply with the standard of care to be exercised by reasonable police officers, proximately causing plaintiff to suffer damages as set forth.

Complaint for Violation of Civil Rights -Jury Trial Demanded

1	.	WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief as set forth.
	2 3 4	EIGHTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress) (Against defendants OFFICERS)
95113 (408) 286-5150	6 7	38. Plaintiff reallege and incorporates by reference herein paragraphs 1 through 37 of this complaint, except for any and all allegation of intentional, malicious, extreme, outrageous, wanton, and oppressive conduct by defendants, and any and all allegations requesting punitive damages.
CA	10 11 12 13	39. At all times herein mentioned, defendants were subject to a duty of care, to avoid causing unnecessary physical harm and distress to citizens. The conduct of defendants, as set forth herein, did not comply with the standard of care to be exercised by reasonable police officers, proximately causing plaintiff to suffer damages as set forth.
San Jose,	15 16	40. The conduct of defendant OFFICERS as set forth herein, was extreme to a set forth herein to a
		society. 41. As a proximate result of defendants' conduct, plaintiff suffered severe and extreme mental and emotional distress. Plaintiff has suffered damages as set forth. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff pray for relief as set forth.
	Law Offices of Anthony Boskovich 28 North	24 // 25 // 26 // 27 Complaint for Violation of Civil Rights - Page Jury Trial Demanded

2

3

4

6

7

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

NINTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

NINTH C	O: 31 Code 8 52.1)
Californi	a Civil Code § 52.1)
inat de	a Civil Code (Sice RS) fendants OFFICERS)
(Agamsi ci	10.176-

- 42. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference herein paragraphs 1 through 41 of this omplaint. 5
- 43. The conduct of defendant OFFICERS as described herein violated Galifornia Civil Code section 52.1, in that they interfered with plaintiff's exercise and enjoyment of her civil rights, as Law Offices of Anthony Boskovich 28 North First Street, 6th Floor, San Jose, CA 95113 (408) 286-5150 enumerated above, through use of wrongful force and false arrest and imprisonment.
 - 44. As a direct and proximate result of defendants' violation of Civil Code section 52.1 plaintill suffered violation of her constitutional rights, and suffered damages as set forth.
 - 45. Since the conduct of defendant officers occurred in the course and scope of their employment, defendant CITY is therefore liable to plaintiff pursuant to respondeat superior.
 - 46. Plaintiff is entitled to an award of reasonable autorney's fees pursuant to Civil Code section 52.1.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief as set forth.

JURY DEMAND

47. Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial in this action.

Complaint for Violation of Civil Rights -

PRAYER

27

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief as follows:

- 1. General damages in an amount no less than \$1,000,000;
- 2. Special damages in an amount no less than \$2,000,000;
- 3. Punitive damages in an amount no less than \$5,000,000;
- 4. Exemplary damages and an additional \$25,000 for each violation against each plaintiff of the Civil Code section 51.7, and reasonable attorney fees, pursuant to Civil Code section 52, subdivision (b);
 - 5. Reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. section 1988;
 - 6. Costs of suit incurred herein; and.
 - 7. Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: 22 June 2008

LAW OFFICES OF ANTHONY BOSKOVICH

Anthony Boskovich Attorney for Plaintiff

Complaint for Violation of Civil Rights -28 Jury Trial Demanded

♦ JS 44	(Rev	12/07)

✓ JS 44 (Rev. 12/07)	CIVIL COVER SHEET	
The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information	n contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of	C-1 15:
by local rules of court 'This form approved by	the Indiain Conference of the United Conference of	pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided

the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON PAGE TWO OF THE FORM.) I. (a) PLAINTIFFS NANCY NAVA			DEFENDANTS OFFICER MIKE SEADLER, et al.		
	irst Listed Plaintiff	Å			
(b) County of Residence of Fi			County of Residence of First	Listed Defendant	
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) Santa Clara (c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)			(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED. Attorneys (If Known)		
San Jose, CA 951	.13	, . .			
<u>(408) 286-5150</u>				0000	6 ""
	ΓΙΟΝ (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CIT	IZENSHIP OF PRINCI	PAL PARTIES (Place	e an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
	X 3 Federal Question	(For D	Diversity Cases Only) PTF DEF	and	One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF
Plaintiff 2 U.S. Government	(U.S. Government Not a Party) 4 Diversity	Citizen of Ti		Incorporated or Principal P.	lace 4 4
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of A	nother State 2 2	of Business In This State Incorporated and Principal	Place 5 5
	·	Citizen or So Foreign C		of Business In Another S Foreign Nation	Gtate 6 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT (P	lace an "X" in One Box Only)				
CONTRACT	TORTS PERSONAL INJURY PERSONA	INIIIDV	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
	310 Airplane 362 Pe	rsonal Injury - ed. Malpractice rsonal Injury - oduct Liability bestos Personal jury Product ability L PROPERTY ther Fraud uth in Lending her Personal operty Damage oduct Liability DNER FIONS tions to Vacate tence COrpus:	of Property 2 1 USC 88 1 630 Liquor Laws 640 R.R. & Truck 650 Airline Regs. 660 Occupational Safety/Health 690 Other LABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act 740 Railway Labor Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act IMMIGRATION 462 Naturalization Application 463 Habeas Corpus Alien Detaince 465 Other Immigration Actions	26 USC 7609	400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act 895 Freedom of Information Act 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes Appeal to District
	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which 42 U.S.C. §1983; Till Brief description of cause:	Reo th you are fili		statutes unless diversity):	7 Judge from Magistrate Judgment
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACT UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	ION DEN	MAND\$ 825,000	X CHECK YES only i	f demanded in complaint: X Yes No
VIII. RELATED CASE(S IF ANY) PLEASE REFER TO "NOTICE OF RELA		3-12 CONCERNING REQUI	REMENT TO FILE	
	GNMENT (CIVIL L.R. 3-2) IN ONE BOX ONLY)		SAN FRANCISCO/OAKL	AND X SA	91/92
DATE 23 June 2008	SIGNATURE C	OF ATTORNEY	of RECORD Anthon	y Boskovich	NDC ISA4